

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-15 currently remain in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14 were previously amended claims. Claims 1 and 7 herein amended.

In response to the document entitled Amendment "E" After Final Action mailed February 22, 2006, the Examiner stated in said Advisory Action that the proposed amendment therein would not be entered because they raised new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. The present RCE is therefore being submitted to have such consideration and/or search to be effected. Thus, the claims section is herein amended in the same way presented in said Amendment "B" After Final Action, and applicant is herein presenting the same argument as before against the Examiner's rejection in said Final Action, that is, applicant amends 1 and 7 to further limit the kind of user program intended in the claims.

In the case of small portable electronic systems of the kind addressed to by the cited reference, key operations and button inputs are generally recognized by the system program through an interrupt and parameters in a table are referenced by using such an interrupt as a trigger. The present invention, by contrast, deals with user programs of the kind that are carried out cyclically. This is therefore made more explicit in the present amendment.

It is therefore hoped that the argument is now more persuasive and that the Examiner will find the application now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

March 27, 2006
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, California 94607
Telephone: (510) 663-1100
Telefax: (510) 663-0920